

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11, 13-16, 18, 20, 21 and 23-31 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 11, 13, 18, 21, 27 and 28 are amended and claims 10, 12, 17, 19 and 22 are canceled. Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features from canceled claim 12, claims 6 and 11 are written in independent form, claim 13 is amended to incorporate the features of canceled claims 17 and 19, claim 18 is amended to reflect the amendments to claim 13, claims 21 and 28 are amended to incorporate the features of canceled claim 12 and claim 27 is amended for clarity. No new matter is added.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Dinh in the December 9, 2009 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 3 contains allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-19 and 21-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bhargava, et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,376,701, in view of Lazaridis, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,219,694. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1, 6, 21 and 28 recite that processing of the attached data includes printing of the attached data. As discussed during the personal interview with respect to canceled claim 12, none of the applied references disclose or would have rendered obvious printing the attached data.

Claim 11 recites that the e-mail message contains a request for a status of the electronic device and the replying e-mail message contains a status of the electronic device to which the processing system belongs. Claim 13 recites that the e-mail message contains a request for the status of a designated device and a replying e-mail message contains the status of the designated device. As discussed during the personal interview, none of the applied

references disclose or would have rendered obvious these features because there is no discussion related to e-mail messages containing requests for or status of devices.

Claim 23 recites an electronic device selecting system that enables an operator of said computer to select at least one of said plurality of electronic devices, information indicative of the selected one of said plurality of electronic devices being inserted in the e-mail message. As discussed during the personal interview, the applied references fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious these features. The Office Action broadly rejects claim 23 based upon the rejection of claim 1 but fails to explain how these features are disclosed in the applied references. Thus, as discussed during the personal interview, Applicant respectfully asserts that the applied references fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious these features.

Claim 27 recites determining whether the e-mail message addressed to the predetermined common e-mail address is directed to the electronic device of the plurality of electronic devices in accordance with the contents of the e-mail message addressed to the predetermined common e-mail address. As discussed during the personal interview, the applied references fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious these features because Bhargava discloses sending e-mails to both a host system 100 and a wireless device 104. See Bhargava at col. 5, lines 65 and 66. Further, Lazaridis fails to overcome the deficiencies of Bhargava because, as discussed during the personal interview, Lazaridis is only cited for the proposition that multiple devices can share a common e-mail address. Thus, the applied references fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious in the above-referenced features of claim 27.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 8-10, 14-16, 18, 23-26 and 29-31 are patentable by reason of their dependency from one of independent claims 1, 6, 13 and 23, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Barghava in view of Lazaridis and Taniguchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,801,962. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The rejection of these claims is premised upon Bhargava and Lazaridis disclosing or having rendered obvious all of the features of claims 6 and 13. As discussed above, these references fail to do so. Further, Taniguchi fails to overcome the deficiencies of these references. Thus, claims 7 and 20 are patentable by reason of their dependency from independent claims 6 and 13, respectively, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Steven D. Jinks
Registration No. 62,760

JAO:SDJ/crh

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension of Time
Amendment Transmittal

Date: January 8, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461